# NWD General Comments

1. Need to make sure that when developing P2, enough flexibility is given to deal with the wide variety and difference of mission areas; customer desires and expectations; and other key stakeholders. Trying to successfully take all of these different needs, issues, concerns, and approaches into account in one database may cause the database to be very large and difficult to manage. Response: Noted.

2. While eliminating data calls is desirable, we are very concerned about how all the data is going to be used by others. In particular, trying to make decisions based upon data without discussion with the District will be very detrimental to the success of P2 and could potentially lead to some very poor decisions. Response: Risks associated have been acknowledged, but the Corps' Strategic Vision mitigates those risks ( empowered to make "an informed" decision in a collaborative way).

3. We are concerned about how much of the data contained in P2 will be available to our customers. Again, the problem is having customers or anyone for that matter using data without engaging in dialogue with the ones inputting the data, and then making decisions based upon the potential misinterpretation of that data. Response: Customer is a part of the PDT, thus communications will be enhanced, mitigating misinterpretation of data.

4. We are concerned about trying to use P2 as a tool to create a virtual USACE as shown in the Appendix of the Preface. While we fully support the Corps acting more corporate, believe that the mindset of being corporate needs to be instilled and ingrained first and then use our tools to help further foster that mindset. The tool without the mindset will be of limited value. Response: This is why Curriculum training has been developed and is proceeding prior to P2 deployment.

5. Premature Shutdown of PRISM. DO NOT SHUTDOWN PRISM UNTIL ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN THAT BUDGET/PROGRAM DATA FROM P2/P3e IS THE SAME AS DATA IN PRISM. Shutting it down by "end of FY03" (Wil Berrios 17 Apr 02 presentation to General Flowers) or "upon full deployment of P2" (REF8010) without this assurance would destroy all credibility in the budget process. Response: Concur.

6. Relationship w/AISs: Please clarify if the AIS, ABS, is to be replaced or interfaced with P2. The briefing charts from 17 Apr 02 say replaced, the narrative in this section says interfaced. Also, the AIS, CWAS, is not discussed in this narrative but the briefing charts referenced above say it is to be replaced. Please clarify. Response: ABS will be replaced "after" the deployment of P2, and upon completion of a full cycle of ABS.

Program, corporate and project reports:  Lack of these roll-up reports was a major failure in PROMIS, that was only partially solved by PPDS.  Examples of Civil Works program and corporate reports include Basic and Current 2101 Schedules, earned value, milestones, and CMR.  These reports should be discussed in the PMBP Communications Plan REF8006. Response:  Agree with the need for reports.  This need is being addressed, however local reporting requirements can be met using standard and ad hoc capabilities of P2.

7. Given the general nature of the current PMBP, this document has some limitations or draw backs as a tool for a computer programmer to use in the development of P2. There is some concern the details in programming which are needed for the P2/CEFMS interface will be provided by only a few people and as such they will establish a detailed Corps business process through the use of P2 programming. This P2 business process may not have the corporate buy-in necessary for acceptance. Response: We are not writing software; we are configuring COTS software to meet Corps data requirements and developing system interfaces with Corporate AISs with the support of SMEs (functional and technical).

8. The detailed degree of scheduling, analysis, and updating required by the current PMBP is not occurring at this time. Given the proposed level of scheduling, analysis, and updating, it will increase the staffing. A PM would be able to manage only one major complex project and a few small projects. Response: Long-run efficiency outweighs short-run complexity. Resourcing of workload should be analyzed locally.

9. It appears that most of the support offices (PAO, Safety, etc.) have a very rigorous analysis process for all projects. This analysis is currently occurring in a less formal manner, but not with the rigor and formality required by the PMBP. Is the value added worth the cost for all projects? Response: Yes, we believe so.

10. Earned value has a use, but is not for all work. The use of earned value should be a team decision. Response: Yes, except where there are corporate requirements to use earned value.

11. Change "customer" scope to 'project" scope – make a global change. Response: Edit team will revise the title of PROC2010 to read "Project Scope and Customer Requirements Definition".

12. Individual PDT members and Resource Providers are responsible for developing and updating their portion of the resource estimates within P2. Until the software is fielded, it is difficult to understand how the PM will monitor the overall budget and schedule if multiple individuals are able to change data. Having everyone proficient in the manipulation of P2 data may not be cost effective. Response: Workload resourcing will be analyzed locally.

13. For CW, need to address in the processes how the "Current 2101 Schedule" fits into the process. The manual addresses the "baseline" but not the "current". Response: The "current" is the schedule that the PDT is working in day-to-day.

14. All acronyms in the Responsibility sections must be spelled out because they are linked to REF 8020. Response: Edit team will review.

15. Is there a capability to link the PMBP Manual to local processes? Response: Capability is being reviewed and addressed.

16. Need a process on managing changes to the PMBP Manual. Response: Configuration Management Process is under development for use by the BP/P2 Configuration Manager.